

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENZI). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 12:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each. Under the previous order, the Senator from Arizona, Mr. MCCAIN, is recognized to speak for up to 15 minutes.

The Senator from Arizona.

(The remarks of Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Mr. HAGEL, pertaining to the introduction of S.J. Res. 20 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the privilege of the floor be granted to an American Political Science Association fellow on the minority staff of the Foreign Relations Committee, David Auerswald, during the pendency of floor debate on Kosovo and the United States use of force when that occurs, and as often as that occurs, on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Minnesota.

KOSOVO

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I actually came to the floor to speak about the crisis in agriculture and what is happening in the Midwest, but I want to respond to some of the comments my colleagues have made, although I will be doing this extemporaneously, and I will be thinking out loud, but I hope I will be thinking deeply.

Mr. President, I agree with my colleague from Nebraska, I agree with all my colleagues who have spoken on the floor about the importance of accountability. I remember previously coming to the floor before we took a recess where it looked as if we might be taking military action in Kosovo—it wasn't clear—and saying I thought we needed to have a full debate and I would support that military action.

I agree with my colleague about the history and how it will judge us. I saw what Milosevic did in Bosnia. I saw enough misery and refugee camps to last me a lifetime. And I certainly do not want to be in a position to have our

country, and other countries, turn their gaze away from the systematic slaughter and massacre and murder of people and driving people out of their country, albeit, unfortunately, I think Milosevic, up to date, has been able to do much of that.

Here is where I just want to express a few concerns, although I think probably later on we will have the debate. This debate probably does not start today, but since I am on the floor I do want to raise a few concerns.

First of all, in the here and now, I think—and I will get a chance this afternoon to put some questions to Secretary Albright—as long as we are talking about stopping the slaughter and given the headlines and the stories in today's papers of Milosevic stopping people from being able to leave the country, we do need to think about these internally displaced refugees and how we can get some relief to them. I still, in my own mind, do not quite understand why we are not doing airlifting, why we are not getting supplies to them. I think it is a difficult question, it could be loss of life. But, again, I say to my colleagues, I want to press very hard on the question of whether or not we should be airlifting some humanitarian relief to people who are obviously going to starve to death otherwise. I am trying to understand why we are not doing that now.

Secondly, in the prosecution of this war, I voted that we conduct the airstrikes. I was hoping we would be able to do much more by way of stopping this slaughter, but I raise the question of why we are not conducting more of the airstrikes in Kosovo. I say this to my colleagues on the floor. I really believe that. And I worry about this. I have to say it on the floor of the Senate. Pretty soon we run out of targets in Serbia. And to the extent that we run out of targets and continue with an expanded air war, there are going to be innocent people who will die, which is very difficult for me.

I think we get to a point where we don't want to undercut the moral claim of what we are doing. I believe we are trying to do the right thing, but I do not understand why we are not prosecuting more of this air war and more of these airstrikes in Kosovo. We are talking about what we need to do now. I do not understand all of the decisionmaking, but I guess in my own mind, I want to press on that question, because it seems to me there is a direct correlation between our being able to do that and whether or not other means will be necessary, as I look at this resolution, and, moreover, whether it doesn't make far more sense to do that. Again, I know there are risks involved, but at the same time I worry about the sort of airstrikes focused on Belgrade and other cities as opposed to Kosovo.

Finally, I say today that I would prefer to hear more discussion. My colleague from Nebraska—you don't know people well, but you just have a feeling

about them—is somebody I really like and respect. That is just all there is to it, period. Everything he says I take as being said in the very best of good faith, very much a part of good faith, with complete sincerity and conviction and knowledge.

I would like to hear in this Chamber more discussion about diplomacy, about where it fits in. I think it is far more important than has been discussed today that we really ask the Russians to be a part of a diplomatic solution. I know we are talking to them about being part, eventually, of some kind of peacekeeping force. I think, by the way, it will not just be a NATO force. I heard my colleagues list that as an objective. I do not think that is going to happen. I don't think it will be a NATO force; I think it will be a very different peacekeeping force.

More than just asking the Russians what they will be a part of, I believe the Russians are in a key position to help forge a diplomatic solution as an alternative to an ever expanding war, consistent with what I believe should be our objectives which are stopping this slaughter of people and people having a chance to go back to their country. I want to see the emphasis on the military action we are taking but also on the diplomatic front. I do not hear that today and it concerns me.

I say to my colleagues that when I see language which talks about "to use all necessary force and other means," it just sounds too broad and too open-ended to me, as a Senator. I am skeptical of such language. There are many answers to many questions that I will pose in debate and discussion. There are many questions I have about this today. I have expressed some of my reservations about this resolution, and I do believe we should have Senator HAGEL in the discussion and the debate that is called for. I think it is important. Otherwise, I think we do abdicate our responsibility, whatever decisions we arrive at. I commend the Senator for it, but I have expressed some of my reservations.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Angad Bhalla, who is an intern in my office, be granted the privilege of the floor today during debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AGRICULTURE CONCERNS

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, we had a gathering in the State of Minnesota on Sunday afternoon. It started about 1 p.m. Joel Klein, who heads the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department, was gracious enough to come. Mike Dunn, who is Assistant Secretary for Agriculture, was gracious enough to come. This will just be 5 minutes' worth, because I am going to be calling on colleagues, especially